Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/028,129	LANDRY-COLTRAIN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Pamela R. Schwartz	1774
All Participants: Status of Application:		
(1) <u>Pamela R. Schwartz</u> .	(3)	
(2) Mr. Konkol.	(4)	•
Date of Interview: 26 September 2007	Time:	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ A  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	· ·	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed: 1, 2, 6-9, 11-14, 18, 25, 29-34, 36, 37, 40, 42 and 46		
Prior art documents discussed:  Maeda et al.		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE Constitution Sheet	GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT W	AS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
<ul> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separative directly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separation not result in resolution of all issues. A brief su</li> </ul>	on. The examiner will provide a wr arate record of the substance of the	itten summary of the substance he interview, since the interview
DAPA VET	State and Parent	
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (App	plicant/Applicant's Representative	Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Because the language of claims 1 and 46 that "at least 68% of said particles" was not relied upon to overcome the prior art, the language concerning "68%" is being deleted from the claims. Other agreed upon modifications are being made to clarify the claims and to add the amendments that were submitted on 8/20/07 but were not entered are being added. The submitted amendment to the specification is unnecessary and is not being entered. Other amendments to clarify the specification have been agreed to. See the Examiner's amendment.